

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO. | - FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/737,179 | 12/13/2000 | Tahir Sadik Khan | LIFE-016 | 8410 | |
| . 7 | 7590 06/19/2003 | | | | |
| Bret Field Bozicevic, Field & Francis LLP Suite 200 200 Middlefield Road Menlo Park, CA 94025 | | | ЕХАМП | EXAMINER | |
| | | | ALEXANDER, LYLE | | |
| | | | . ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| , - | | | 1743 DATE MAILED: 06/19/2003 | 12 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Application No. | Applican | t(s) | | | |
| Office Action Summary | | 09/737,179 | KHAN E1 | AL. | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Lyle A Alexander | 1743 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| THE - External filter - If the - If NO - Failure - Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION resions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a represent of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuely received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | .136(a). In no event, however the statutory mining the statutory mining the statutory mining the statutory and will expire Solote, cause the application to | er, may a reply be timely filed num of thirty (30) days will be consi X (6) MONTHS from the mailing da secome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. | dered timely. ate of this communication. § 133). | | | |
| 1)🛛 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 | April 2003 . | | | | | |
| 2a) <u></u> ☐ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ T | his action is non-fin | al. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-11,13,14,16,19-21 and 23-27</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| 5) | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)🖂 | 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-11,13,14,16,19-21 and 23-27</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8) 🗌 | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documen | its have been receiv | ed. | - | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| | cknowledgment is made of a claim for domes | - | | visional application) | | | |
| a | ☐ The translation of the foreign language pracknowledgment is made of a claim for domes | ovisional applicatio | n has been received. | , , | | | |
| Attachment | | F | | ••• | | | |
| 2) Notice | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 5) 🔲 1 | nterview Summary (PTO-413) lotice of Informal Patent Applic ther: | | | | |
| .S. Patent and Tr PTO-326 (Re | | Action Summary | Part of Pa | per No. 12 | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/737,179

Art Unit: 1743

Claim R jections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-7,9-11,13-14,16,19-21 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloepfer in view of either Henschen et al. or Gargan.

Kloepfer teaches making a blood test strip that can detect glucose (see col. 11 line 44). Figure 11 demonstrates how the test strips are cut out of a precursor comprising an elongated support material. Kloepfer is silent to the claimed interdigitating pattern of the precursor on the test strip.

Henschen et al. teaches in column 9 lines 4+ that two interdigitated rows of electrodes are advantageous because it save the amount of metal required when compared to a single row of terminals.

Gargan teaches in column 4 lines 10+ teach a stamped interdigitating pattern takes up less material because less material is wasted and therefore would have a lower production cost.

It would have been within the skill of the art to modify Kloepfer in view of Henschen et al. or Gargan and use an interdigitating pattern when outlining the test devices on the precursor to gain the above advantages of requiring less material and a lower production cost.

The modified method of Kloepfer is silent to the claimed aspect ratio of 0.5 and a lance.

Application/Control Number: 09/737,179

Art Unit: 1743

The court decided <u>In re Boesch</u> 205 USPQ 215 that optimization of a result effective variable is ordinarily within the skill of the art. A result effective variable is one that has predictable and well-known results. The relative dimension of the test device are a result effective variable based upon the desired application and marketing requirements. Also, the use of a standard solution and a lance for drawing a blood sample are result effective variable having the expected and well known function of providing standardization and drawing blood.

It would have been within the skill of the art to further modify Kloepfer to have a sample application region with an aspect ratio of 0.5 as optimization of a result effective variable based upon the desired application and marketing specifications. Additionally, one would further modify Kloepfer and supply a standard solution and lance to gain the advantage of having means to standardize and draw a blood sample as optimization of a result effective variable.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloepfer Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloepfer in view of Henschen et al. or Gargan as applied to claims 1-7,9-11,13-14,16,19-21,23 and 25-27 above, and further in view of Garcia et al.

Kloepfer in view of Henschen et al. or Gargan is silent to the claimed lance.

Garcia et al. teach it is desirable to supply a lance with a blood test kit so that a sample can be safely and comfortly drawn.

It would have been within the skill of the art to further modify Kloepfer in view of Garcia et al. and supply a lance to gain the above advantages.

Page 4

R spons to Argum nts

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7,9-11,13-14,16,19-21 and 23-27 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A Alexander whose telephone number is 703-308-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 703-308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9319 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

Lyle A Alexander Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743

June 16, 2003
